

## **Gulf of Alaska Rationalization Overview of the Alternatives and Options Discussion**

The attached documents address several issues that relate to development and analysis of alternatives in the the Council motion from April 2003. First, the documents propose a reorganization of the Council motion from April 2003. The current organization of the elements and options in the motion does not lend itself to understanding the different alternatives that are created from the options. In addition, several provisions of that motion overlap with one another. To avoid overlap, each provision is included in a single location in the proposed revision. In some sections of the April 2003 motion, provisions from other sections are incorporated by reference. The interpretation of those references and their interplay with other provisions is often unclear and subject to several interpretations. The discussion in the attached documents attempts to include any reasonable interpretation for comprehensiveness.

The complexity of the different program alternatives make the development of a single document supporting those alternatives very difficult. To assist the reader in understanding the scope of alternatives being considered “alternative descriptions” are provided (Document A). These provide a brief description of each alternative supported by the motion and identify the elements of the alternative and the options that might be selected for inclusion in the alternative. The current motion contains 12 primary alternatives, each with several permutations. **Several of the alternatives in the motion are very similar to one another, providing little analytical contrast and greatly complicating the analysis. Staff is hopeful that the Council will use this meeting to narrow the number of alternatives substantially. A reasonable range of contrasting alternatives for analysis could be four or five selected from the April 2003 motion. Within those alternatives, options may be retained for some aspects, but those options should not pertain to the general structure of the program. If the Council chooses to delay narrowing the selection of alternatives for analysis, the completion of the analysis will be delayed.**

To maintain the proposed timeline, staff intends to provide the Council with preliminary analysis of several different elements and options at its October 2003 meeting. This could support and facilitate the Council’s further narrowing of the elements and options to provide staff with a workable, reasonable range of alternatives for analysis in the EIS. If the Council is unable to narrow the number of options substantially at the October meeting, it is very likely that the completion of the EIS will be delayed substantially from the proposed timeline.

To aid the Council in narrowing the alternatives and reformulating the motion at this meeting, the following documents are provided:

- 1) A renumbered version of the April 2003 motion (Document B). The only change from the Council motion is the inclusion of a decimal numbering system, which is intended to add precision to referencing. The original number of the Council’s motion is retained, with the new decimal numbering added in parentheses.
- 2) A discussion of some of the issues that arise under the different elements (Document C). In this document, references are made to the decimal number system in the April 2003 motion. If the provision is moved to a different section in the proposed revision to the motion the new location is referenced in italics.

- 3) The proposed revision of the Council's motion (Document D). This document maintains all provisions of the Council's original motion with some reorganization. Since the document is reorganized, each provision is referenced to the original motion. The document is organized as follows:

### **Section 1 - Status Quo**

### **Section 2 - Harvest Sector Provisions**

This section is Section 2 of the April motion and is referred to as "Harvest Share Program" in that motion. The order of this section is very similar to that of Section 2 of the April 2003 motion. Adoption of provisions of this section alone would form a harvester-only IFQ program. Since these provisions form the foundation of harvest sector management under all of the alternatives, the title is changed.

### **Section 3 - Processing Sector Provisions**

This section derived from the elements and options of Section 3.1 ("Closed Processor Class") and Section 4 ("Processor Share Program") in the April 2003 motion. The section is divided into two parts, one for each of the different processor provisions. The adoption of provisions from Section 2 and Section 3.1 alone would establish a harvest share program with a closed class of processors. The adoption of provisions from Section 2 and Section 3.2 alone would create a two-pie IFQ program (with harvest and processing shares).

### **Section 4 - Cooperative Provisions**

This section brings together the different cooperative provisions proposed in the April 2003 motion. Provisions are consolidated from Sections 2.2, 3.2, and 4.2. The provisions are separated into several different subsections to assist the reader in determining the type of cooperative program created by the selection of provisions in a section. In addition, the alternative descriptions provide a guide to selecting provisions to make a workable cooperative program.